




The g-2 laser calibration system: testing the light distribution chain

Agnese Bonavita

September 22, 2016


Supervisors: Carlo Ferrari, Anna Driutti



The g-2 experiment




The Muon g-2 experiment will examine the precession of muons that are subjected to a magnetic field.




- **Goal of the experiment:** test the Standard Model's predictions of the muon anomalous magnetic moment to a precision of 0.14 parts per million.
- **Focusing on the calorimeter**

The g-2 calorimeter




The main features of the calorimeter:

1. Measure positron hit time accurately (100 psec above 100 MeV);
2. Measure deposited energy with resolution better than 5% at 2 GeV




A calorimeter station will consist of 54 lead fluoride (PbF_2) crystals in a 6 high by 9 wide array, with each crystal read out on the rear face using a SiPM coupled directly to the crystal surface.



Why a laser calibration?


- To synchronize the 24 calorimeters.
- To calibrate the photon detection efficiency of the SiPM sending simultaneous light calibration pulses into the SiPM through the active crystals (PbF_2) that make up the calorimeters and then couple into bundles of optical fibers.
- Light pulses should be stable in intensity and timing in order to correct systematic effects due to drifts in the response of the crystal readout devices.
- Light wavelength must be in the spectral range accepted by the detector and determined by the convolution of the spectral density of the Cherenkov signal produced by electrons in PbF_2 with the spectral transmission of the crystals
- Pulsed diode lasers in the blue seem to best address all the criteria.

Laser calibration scheme



Multilaser with 6 heads; 24 launching fibers; 24 diffuser, 6 Source monitoring; 24 local monitoring

MONITORS




Most important feature of the calibration system : LIGHT STABILITY

- To be sure that this level of stability is maintained during data taking a monitoring procedure has to be included in this calibration system → a Source Monitor (SM) and a Local Monitor (LM) are used.
- SM: PMT that reads out LCAL and LSM pulse-to-pulse;
- LM: measures the laser stability;
- The ratio $LCAL/LSM$ is a measurement of the (possible) fluctuations on the light due to the distribution chain.

STATUS OF THE MECHANICS

- All Front Panels are ready and filled with the crystals
- All Beam Splitters are ready
- All Collimators are assembled



FRONT PANEL WITH 54 CRYSTALS PRISMS




BEAM SPLITTER




COLLIMATORS

Fibers assemblance



- We cut and spliced the fibers and prepared the bundles
- We test the power of every fiber of the bundle (we want an average power $\sim 4\mu\text{W}$) and we cleaned and fixed the ones which




G-2 Calibration System



G-2 Calibration System



07210.A2
03300.A1




Data Analysis

The data are from a recent test beam at SLAC

Two LMs available:

- LM1(channel 5) both pulses;
- LM2(channel 7) only first pulse;
- Pulses separated in time approximately 250ns;




Example of LMs output




Main issue: subtracting the baseline and the background noise → we tried many different ways;

Best idea: subtraction using a template event-per event

Details on the baseline subtraction




LM PMT Calibration



- Persistency plot of 6000 events;
- noise in the first pulse not completely removed.

LM PMT Calibration



Filter wheel allows to take measurements with different light intensities. Only the light in the second pulse is affected.



Using the second pulse we can test the linearity and the photo-statistics of the PMT.

From pulse to charge

Two methods to evaluate the charged of the signal:

by performing an integration around the peaks (with a fixed ranged);

- ♦ spurious noise might be included;
- ♦ pulses outside the range are not properly integrated.




by performing a fit with the template;

- ♦ Template from data: spline of the average of the 2nd pulse of independent run.
- ♦ residual baseline and noise excluded.

Linearity of PMT


Using the calibration runs we check the linearity of the PMT response:

Linearity peak2





Transmittance: fraction of radiant energy that having entered a layer of absorbing matter reaches its farther boundary.

- For each run we fit with a Gaussian function the distributions of the two integrals



Comparison: similar results from the two methods




- Linearity obtained with the template fit
- Linearity obtained with the integral calculation of the two peaks

Photoelectron calibration


And we performed the calibration through the p.e. statistics:

- p_0 = electronic noise;
- p_1 = mean/pe (pe are the photoelectrons)
- p_2 = contribution proportional to the signal.


The relationship between the mean and the variance allows us to determine the amount of light that arrives to the detector in function of the number of photoelectrons produced.



Comparison



- Photostatics calculated by the integration of the peaks



- Photostatics calculated by the template fit

Similar results from the two methods: at max (no filters) measured 910 p.e. And 870 p.e. respectively.



Timing

The time between the two pulses is a characteristic of the system.


$$time = \frac{distance}{c/n}$$

$$D_T(SM - LM) \sim \frac{2}{0.3/1.5} \sim 10ns$$

$$D_T(collimator - calorimeter - LM) \sim \frac{50}{0.3/1.5} \sim 250ns$$



Stability



- Analyzed runs from 1762 to 1775 (time of the measurement: 1h 30 min)
- During run 1766 and 1767 there were DAQ problems;
- Fluctuations measured with a precision of about $\pm 0.05\%$ in ~ 7 min.

Conclusions

HARDWARE: I've been involved in the assemblance of the laser calibration system. In D0 building I set the panels and the beam splitters, I arranged the fiber bundles and I linked together all the parts. The majority of the setup is now ready to future uses.

SOFTWARE: I performed a complete analysis of a subset of the LM data. The main challenge was the presence of background noise so that I compared numerous methods to subtract it. Preliminary results show small fluctuations during 1.5h of data-taken. Future prospective of this work is analyzing the entire data available.

A BIG THANKS TO:

- My supervisors Carlo Ferrari and Anna Driutti for the help and the assistance in every single day of this internship. They had the patience and the capability to involve me in their activities within the experiment and to explain me all I needed to know. I really appreciated their care of me.
- The professors Giorgio Bellettini, Simone Donati and Emanuela Barzi to give me the opportunity to participate at this summer school and the chance to work in a team of physicists and students in an international environment.
- All the other summer students that lived with me these incredible two months..

THANK YOU!!!